

## REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 27-28 and 30-37 will be canceled, and claims 1, 10, 12, 15, will be amended. As a result, claims 1-26 and 29 will remain pending. These changes have been made solely to expedite prosecution of the present application, and no new matter has been added. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the originally filed claims in this and other applications. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's statement that 27 and 30 as originally filed contained allowable subject matter. Claims 26 and 29 have been amended in view of the Examiner's statement and should therefore be allowable.

Claims stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over the Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of US Publication Number 2005/0080842 ("Takeuchi").

According to the Office Action, the AAPA teaches that an asynchronous message can be used to transmit an indication of a change in current media status (*e.g.*, a CD has been inserted into or removed from a disk drive).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Although the insertion or removal of a CD may be considered an "asynchronous" occurrence, the reporting of the change (*e.g.*, via a message from a disk drive to a host system) can be performed using a synchronous message. Thus, none of the references disclose "transmitting an asynchronous message ... as a result of [a] current determination" that a current media status has changed as recited in the pending claims (or similar language). As a result, Applicant's request reconsideration of the rejection.

Takeuchi merely teaches that asynchronous messages may be used for things other than a change in current media status. Applicants respectfully do not understand how paragraph [0006] of Takeuchi provides a motivation to report a current media status change in an asynchronous message of a type that is also transmitted for other reasons. Because there is no teaching or suggestion to modify the references in this way, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection.

Applicants also respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 5 (or further details on the reason(s) why claim 5 stands rejected).

With respect to claims 7, 13, 16, and 22, Applicants respectfully suggest that the AAPA does not disclose that query for a current media status is transmitted (*e.g.*, when the information is provided in a synchronous message, no query would be transmitted).


Applicants' silence with respect to certain comments made in the Office Action (*e.g.*, associated with various dependent claims) is not an indication that the Applicants agree with those comments.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-0191.

March 6, 2006  
Date

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. Buckley  
Registration No. 40,928  
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC  
Attorneys for INTEL Corporation  
Five Elm Street  
New Canaan, CT 06840  
(203) 972-0191